

Serial No. 10/059,623
December 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated September 8, 2003
Page 16 of 27

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-33 are pending in this application. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 13-22 and 24-33 from consideration. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND the Drawings, the Specification, and claims 12 and 23 and CANCEL claims 1-11 and 34-44.

Applicants affirm the election of Species I, including Fig. 1. The Examiner has alleged that there are no generic claims in paragraph no. 1 in the outstanding Office Action and has alleged that only claim 1 is generic in the Restriction Requirement, dated June 4, 2003. Applicants respectfully disagree.

MPEP § 806.04(d) states that a generic claim:

- (a) should read on all the species; AND
- (b) cannot include features not present in each of the added species claims.

By definition, an independent claim is generic to all of its dependent claims. Applicants' claim 12 and 23 are clearly generic because (a) claims 12 and 23 read on each and every one of the species indicated by the Examiner; and (b) claims 12 and 23 do not include any features that are not present in each of the species.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider and allow withdrawn claims 13-22 and 24-33 when generic claims 12 and 23 are allowed.

The Drawings were objected to for numerous reasons in paragraph no. 3(a) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action.

The Examiner has alleged that Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 16D, 17-20, 23, 25-27 need to be properly cross-hatched. Applicants respectfully disagree. MPEP § 608.02 states that "[t]he following [cross-hatch] symbols should be used to indicate various materials where the material is an important feature of the invention" (emphasis added). That is, the cross-hatch symbols shown in MPEP § 608.02 are not required. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that cross-hatch symbols used in Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 16D, 17-20, 23, 25-27 are proper.

Serial No. 10/059,623
December 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated September 8, 2003
Page 17 of 27

Applicants have amended Figs. 11, 16D, 18, and 19 to include the reference numerals as suggested by the Examiner.

The Drawings were objected to for failing to designate Figs. 23 and 25-27 as --Prior Art--. Applicants have amended Figs. 23 and 25-27 to properly be designated as --Prior Art--.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the Drawings.

The Examiner objected to the Specification for allegedly containing minor informalities.

The Examiner made numerous objections to the Specification in paragraph 2(a) of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants have amended the Specification to correct the minor informalities noted by the Examiner.

The Examiner alleged that reference number 143 in Figs. 6 and 9 are not described in the Specification in paragraph no. 2(b) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action. However, reference number 143 is not used in either Fig. 6 or Fig. 9. It appears that the Examiner intended to refer to reference number 43, not reference number 143. Reference number 43 is described in the last full paragraph on page 12 of the originally filed Specification. Applicants respectfully request clarification of this objection.

The Examiner alleged that reference number 10 in Fig. 20 is not described in the Specification in paragraph no. 2(b) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants have amended the Specification to correct this minor informality.

The Examiner alleged that reference numbers 107, 108, 109 in Fig. 15 are not described in the Specification in paragraph no. 2(b) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action. However, reference numbers 107, 108, 109 are described in the last paragraph on page 25 of the Specification.

The Examiner alleged that reference number 10 in Fig. 20 is not described in the Specification in paragraph no. 2(b) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action. However, reference number 10 is not used in Fig. 20. Applicants respectfully request

Serial No. 10/059,623
December 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated September 8, 2003
Page 18 of 27

clarification of this objection.

The Examiner alleged that reference number 15 in Fig. 25 is not described in the Specification in paragraph no. 2(b) on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action.

Applicants have amended the Specification to correct this minor informality.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the Specification.

Claims 1, 12, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Richards et al. (U.S. 5,834,995) or Matsui et al. (6,144,268). Applicants have canceled claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 12 and 23.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite:

"A microstrip line, comprising:
a dielectric substrate having a front surface and a back surface;
a ground electrode provided on the back surface of said dielectric substrate; and
a line electrode provided on the front surface of the dielectric substrate; wherein
edge electrodes are provided at edges on both sides of the line electrode;
said edge electrodes are arranged substantially perpendicular to the front surface of the dielectric substrate; and
the line electrode is defined by only a single layer electrode."
(emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 12 recites the feature of "the line electrode is defined by only a single layer electrode." Applicants' claim 23 recites features which are similar to features recited in Applicants' claim 12, including the above emphasized features. With the improved features of claim 1, Applicants have been able to provide a microstrip line that reduces the edge effect of the line electrode (see, for example, the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the originally filed Specification).

Serial No. 10/059,623
December 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated September 8, 2003
Page 19 of 27

Applicants have amended claims 12 and 23 to recite the feature of "the line electrode is defined by only a single layer electrode." Neither Richards et al. nor Matsui et al. teach or suggests this feature.

Richards et al. clearly teaches in **Figs. 12 and 14a** that the line electrode is composed of two layers, **NOT** composed of a single layer as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23. Richards et al. clearly discloses in the second full paragraph in column 7 that "the cylindrical edge elements are formed by electroplating the exposed lateral edges of the microstrip conductor [line electrode] ..." In other words, Richards et al. discloses that the line electrode includes two layers. Thus, Richards et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the line electrode is defined by only a single layer electrode" as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23.

Matsui et al. clearly teaches in **Figs. 16A and 16B** that the line electrode is composed of multiple layers, **NOT** composed of a single layer as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23. Matsui et al. clearly discloses in lines 47-49 of column 7 that "a multilayer thin-film electrode 30 bent at both edges is formed on the opposite surface of the dielectric plate 1" (emphasis added). Thus, Matsui et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the line electrode is defined by only a single layer electrode" as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Richards et al. or Matsui et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Richards et al. and Matsui et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claims 12 and 23 of the present application. As noted above, since claims 12 and 23 are generic, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider and allow claims 13-22 and 24-33 upon allowance of generic claims 12 and 23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit

Serial No. 10/059,623
December 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated September 8, 2003
Page 20 of 27

that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2003


Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080